

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Each of claims 1, 5, 13, 15, 21, 25, 36, 51, and 53 was amended solely for reasons unrelated to patentability, including at least one of: to explicitly present one or more elements implicit in the claim as originally written when viewed in light of the specification thereby not narrowing the scope of the claim, to detect infringement more easily, to enlarge the scope of infringement, to cover different kinds of infringement (direct, indirect, contributory, induced, and/or importation, etc.), to expedite the issuance of a claim of particular current licensing interest, to target the claim to a party currently interested in licensing certain embodiments, to enlarge the royalty base of the claim, to cover a particular product or person in the marketplace, and/or to target the claim to a particular industry.

Claims 1-58 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 21, 36, and 51 are the independent claims.

I. The Indefiniteness Rejection

Claims 13-20, 25, and 51-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Given the amendments presented herein, this rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. The Obviousness Rejection

Claims 1-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Koppolu (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,058) in view of Bonet (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,242). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the cited references, either alone or in any combination, establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be

met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure." See MPEP § 2143.

Each of independent claims 1, 13, 21, 36, and 51 recite "**registering said specific instance**" after "**determining that said specific instance is not registered ... and that said specific instance is already running**". Koppolu does not expressly or inherently teach or suggest "**registering said specific instance**" after "**determining that said specific instance is not registered ... and that said specific instance is already running**".

Instead, Koppolu allegedly recites when "**the moniker 120 can look in the running objects table ... [I]f the object exists, the moniker 120 can simply return an interface pointer of the existing object to the client 104, and thus avoid creating the object again**". See col. 15 lines 60-63. Thus, Koppolu does not disclose an object that is "**not registered**" and "**already running**".

Thus, Koppolu does not teach or suggest "**registering said specific instance**" after "**determining that said specific instance is not registered ... and that said specific instance is already running**". Bonet does not overcome the deficiencies of Koppolu.

Thus, even if there were motivation or suggestion to modify or combine the cited references (an assumption with which the applicant disagrees), and even if there were a reasonable expectation of success in combining or modify the cited references (another assumption with which the applicant disagrees), the cited references still do not expressly or inherently teach or suggest **every limitation** of the independent claims, and consequently fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

PATENT

Serial No. 09/506,640

Attorney Docket No. 1999P07475US01 (1009-023)

Because no *prima facie* rejection of any independent claim has been presented, no *prima facie* rejection of any dependent claim can be properly asserted. Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application as amended is in clear condition for allowance. Reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. 50-2504. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 434-972-9988 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Haynes PLC

Date: 30 July 2004



Michael N. Haynes
Registration No. 40,014

1341 Huntersfield Close
Keswick, VA 22947
Telephone: 434-972-9988
Facsimile: 815-550-8850